(SRI S. SHIVAPPA)

statement made by the Hon'ble Education Minister. You said that you would bring it to the notice of the Education Minister and that he would make a correct statement.

MR. SPEAKER.—I have already passed it on to the Minister for Education. He is not here today. I shall see that it is dealt with before we rise.

Speaker's Ruling regarding Breach of Privilege raised by Sri Namoshi.

MR. SPEAKER.— The Hon'ble Member, Sri Namoshi has given notice of what he calls a question of privilege. His complaint is that, though he whole-heartedly supported the resolution relating to the Chinese Aggression, the Hon'ble Chief Minister in his reply to that debate stated that he was the only member in the House who never uttered a single word against the Chinese Aggression. That an Hon'ble Member's speech has not been properly understood by another Hon'ble Member or Members is not a matter of privilege. The Hon'ble Member has made his speech. How another Member or other Members understand him is not a matter within the control of either the Chair or the House.

I have gone through the Hon'ble Member's speech. He has observed as follows :—

"ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಹೃತ್ಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ..... ಈಗ ಸದ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಚೀನೀಯರು ನನ್ನ ಮೇಲೆ ಆಕ್ರಮಣ ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಎಷ್ಟು ಕಠೋರವಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಖಂಡಿಸಿದರೂ ಅದು ಕಡಿಮೆಯಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟ ಪಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ."

Whether as alleged by the Hon'ble Member, this means that he condemns the Chinese Aggression or whether as observed by the Hon'ble Chief Minister, he has not condemned the Chinese Aggression but merely approved of condemnation by the House is a matter with which I am not concerned.

In the circumstances, the question of breach of privilege is not involved.

Chief Minister's Statement on Krishna-Godavari Report.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—Sir, I had given an assurance to the House a few days back that I would make a statement regarding the policy of this Government in respect of the Krishna waters dispute in the light of the latest position which has emerged after the receipt of the Report of the Krishna-Godavari Commission. We have received a copy of the report recently. The report is a very voluminous document containing the full statistics and data of the Krishna and Godavari rivers, making an assessment of what the yields of the river are and what the demands of the various States are. We have been making a study of this Report and a preliminary discussion with the officials at the Central Water and Power Commission has just been completed.

One very outstanding fact which emerges very clearly from the Report is the vindication of our stand in respect of the so-called 1951 allocations. As members are aware, the Mysore Government has not ratified this so-called agreement and has consistently stated that this allocation is not acceptable as it is an unfair distribution of the Krishna waters and that the vital interests of the areas mostly in the then Bombay had not been properly and fully represented. The Gulhati Commission has worked for over one year touring the various States, holding discussions with technical officers and collecting all the facts and figures which are available. In spite

(Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA)

of this, the Commission themselves have been reluctant to give 100% accurate assessment of the yields of the rivers. They still state that more studies will have to be done to get the correct facts and figures. If this is the position after such a lengthy technical study it is quite evident that this 1951 so-called agreement cannot possibly survive because it was done in haste without proper data and study. It is therefore imperative that the Government of India recognised this fact and once and for all set aside any assumptions based on the 1951 so-called agreement.

Another fact which very clearly emerges from the Commission's report is that the demands made by all the States are far in excess of the availability of water in the Krishna river. It is therefore clear that steps will have to be taken either to augment supplies in the river or to delete the demands made by States which are untenable and in any case to distribute whatever is available to the States on an equitable basis.

In respect of augmenting supplies the Commission has recommended two possible link canals between Godavari and Krishna. We feel that the major solution will be a large scale canal from Inchampalli Reservoir on the Godavari to the lower reaches of the Krishna. I believe this will bring about 1000 TMC Ft. additional supplies to the Krishna.

Regarding the pruning of the demands of the various States we feel that this will have to be done on the basis of certain equitable principles, The Government of Mysore has all along urged these principles both in the Memorandum prepared as well as in various statements made by us, namely—

(*a*) so long as Krishna is a deficit river, there is no question of taking out its water to feed areas which do not come under the basin of the Krishna river. There are a number of projects in sister States which are based on this conception and it is not fair that such schemes should be sanctioned ;

(*b*) the schemes which contemplate the diversion of Krishna basin waters for purposes of power generation into the Arabian Sea will also have to be dropped. So long as there is not sufficient water for irrigating the thirsty and famine-stricken areas it is not morally justified to make the position worse by diverting water into the sea. While we certainly appreciate the need for power development we feel that this should be done on rivers which do not affect irrigation interests. As members are aware, in Mysore State itself, we have got a vast potential for hydro-electric development on west-ward flowing rivers such as Sharavathi, Kalinadi, Bedthi and Aghanashini where no irrigation interest is affected at all.

Having augmented the supplies of water in the river and having in the manner indicated by us pruned down inequitable demands on the river the balance which is then available must be shared between the States on the basis of equitable principles. The fact that certain States have had the advantage of history and have commenced irrigation projects earlier than others should not permanently damage the interests and peace and prosperity of thousands of people living in backward famine-stricken areas. The principle suggested by us are very clear, namely that the river water should be distributed in proportion to the contribution made by each State in respect of the basin area, the culturable command, scarcity areas and population.

I have seen a statement made very recently by the Chief Minister,

(Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA)

Andhra Pradesh, suggesting that during the emergency the consideration of the Gulhati Commission report should be set aside and that all schemes included in the Third Five-Year Plan should be proceeded with. I am afraid that the acceptance of this position will very greatly damage the permanent interest of cultivators in the Krishna basin. I am not speaking with the limited views of Mysore State. But I prefer to look at the development of the basin as a whole, If the schemes included in the Third Five-Year Plan alone are to be proceeded with many of the principles mentioned by me will have to be violated. Water will be taken away outside the basin area and nothing will then be left for major schemes to be undertaken in famine areas. There are big schemes likethe Upper Krishna Project, the Upper Tungabhadra Project. Bijapur Lift Irrigation Scheme, Bhima Project which unfortunately do not appear in the Third Plan. Water will have to be made available to these schemes as earlier as possible. I have to mention that the largest scarcity area in the Krishna basin is in Mysore and that the percentage of irrigated area in Mysore State is 6 per cent whereas in Madras it is about 30-35 per cent. in Andhra Pradesh it is about 26 per cent and in Maharashtra it is 8 per cent. Any just and equitable decision will have to clearly bear this in mind.

These are my preliminary view on the question at the present stage. I would certainly welcome any Inter-State discussions at the highest level for finding an amicable settlement of this question which would keep in view equitable principles and which will not permanently mortgage the future of the most backward areas which are to be found in our State.

Sri G. V. GOWDA (Palya).—Could that report be made available to the house ?

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.— Sir, it cannot be made available.

REPORT OF THE BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

MR. SPAKER.— I beg to present the Sixth Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—(Sri A. R. Panchagavi).— I beg to move.

"That the Assembly agrees with the Sixth Report of the Business Advisory Committee."

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Assembly agrees with the Sixth Report of the Business Advisory Committee."

The Motion was adopted.

Members' Representatives.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Sir I would like to have a clarification from the Hon'ble Chief Minister. When the Chief Minister of Andhra has told that in view of the emergency all the projects have got to be taken up immediately, I feel that the very claim of Mysore would be defeated. What steps the Government of Mysore has taken or propose to take to see that no sanction from the Centre would be given to those projects ?

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—I do not think that will arise. However, I am taking every possible step to see that our interests are safeguarded.